

California Department of Conservation

2004 Watershed Coordinator Grant Program

Report on
Fact Finding Workshops



Background

In 2000, the California Legislature approved a two-year \$2 million pilot grant program to fund watershed coordinators for Resource Conservation Districts, to be administered by the Department of Conservation (DOC). Due to the great success of the pilot program, the California Bay Delta-Authority (CBDA) partnered with DOC to extend the program for another 18 months. As the importance of the program has become evident, DOC continues to work with the CBDA to expand the program with funding from Proposition 50. The current grant program is open to additional organizations and will provide \$9 million for a three-year period, beginning Spring 2004.

Workshops

In an effort to ensure stakeholder participation, DOC held five fact-finding workshops throughout the state. The workshops were held in Marysville, Anderson, Fresno, Oakland, and Riverside. More than 200 people attended the meetings and provided valuable information which will be used in developing the Request for Proposals (RFP). Topics covered were diverse. However, DOC specifically requested input on watershed boundaries, facilitating partnerships/cooperation, and program sustainability.

Contents

This report includes the agenda that was used during the workshops. In addition, comments made during the workshops are included in this report. Each workshop's comments are identified separately by location. DOC, as of this report date, has not finalized the RFP.

Further Information

Thanks for everyone's contribution and comments. For further information, please contact Andrew Rush with the Department of Conservation at (916) 322-9721



California Department of Conservation 2004 Watershed Coordinator Grant Program Informational Workshop

Agenda

I.	Welcome, Introductions, Objectives	1:00
II.	Grant Program Overview	1:10
III.	Facilitated Session to Solicit Feedback	
	1. USGS Watershed Boundaries	1:30
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How should large watersheds be addressed?	
	2. Partnering and Coordination within watersheds	2:10
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How can we ensure cooperation rather than competition?• What should be required from applicants to document partnerships?• How can we ensure a wide distribution of grants with limited funds?	
	Break	2:50
	3. Eligibility	3:00
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nonprofit organizations, special districts, and local governments• How should applicants verify nonprofit status?	
	4. Costs	3:20
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allowable: Salaries and associated costs• Non-allowable: Project-related costs generally not allowed• What is the definition of a project cost?	
	5. Sustainability	3:40
	6. Other Comments	4:00
IV.	Wrap-up	4:25
V.	Adjourn	4:30

1. USGS Watershed Boundaries

- Limit the number or type of organizations that can get grants within a watershed.
- Will DOC coordinate regional meetings for the watershed coordinators to ensure regional cooperation within designated CALFED areas? Answer: At this time DOC is planning annual meetings for the watershed coordinators, but no final decision has been made.
- USGS HUC code boundaries are too broad because of physical and community separation. It is much too complicated for one coordinator to work within the entire watershed. (DOC staff requested other options) – No response.
- Will boundaries be changed? There are other maps that could be used.
- Watershed groups have already divided up the sub-watersheds. Boundaries already exist.
- Some potential applicants are organized according to political boundaries.
- Can the USGS watersheds be broken down into sub-watersheds?
- CALFED should allow sub-watersheds.
- Allow applications based on other factors, such as location. For example, elevation has an impact. The needs of the watershed are different at higher elevations than at lower elevations. Often an organization operating at higher elevations doesn't get input from groups operating in lower elevations. There could be as many as three different watersheds within each USGS designated watershed.
- Should not restrict the number of applications per watershed.
- Leave burden of proof to the applicant that the sub-watershed is okay.
- The regional water board has prioritized watersheds. Has DOC taken their list into account? Priority should be based on level of impact.
- Will CALFED solicit more proposals for the areas that do not get a watershed coordinator, in essence fill in the gaps. Answer: No, these grants will be the only ones and will not cover all watersheds. We expect to Fund about 50.
- Would like to see a watershed coordinator funded for a single resource issue for a watershed. For example, water quality.
- Is it possible to layer maps to include other boundaries? This would help develop partnerships and facilitate interactions.
- Legacy program has maps that could be used.
- CALFED's ERP has watershed boundary maps. DOC should consider using them.
- Allow work in sub-watersheds (example – combine upper and lower Kings Basin and upper and lower Yuba watersheds).

2. Partnering and Coordination within watersheds

How Can We Ensure Cooperation rather than Competition?

- Large watersheds have a lot of groups.
- Can there be a pre-application phase that identifies every organization that plans to submit a proposal?
- Can DOC share with the applicants who else submitted proposals?
- Organizations that have an interest in submitting a proposal must contact DOC and get a pin #. DOC could publish Qualified Applicant List and it would be up to groups thereafter to coordinate their proposals.
- DOC should accept more than one proposal per watershed or a discontented group could sabotage other applications by submitting one on their own.
- Should be a two-step process. Initially submit a concept proposal. Only the applications that pass the concept phase would be evaluated.
- Three step process: 1) Submit Letter of Intent that the applicant plans to compete, 2) List the organizations on a web site, 3) All groups work together on a regional basis to determine how each watershed will submit a proposal
- Establish priorities based on the complexity of the groups operating within the watershed. Some watersheds have many more stakeholders and require greater interaction.
- Someone from the Sacramento River Watershed stated that it would be a significant challenge to simply contact all the stakeholders and organizations within the watershed.
- DOC should facilitate communication within the watersheds.
- Like to see a 30 day public comment period before the final award is made to any organization. Someone immediately disagreed and felt that this was a bad idea.

What Should Be Required to Prove Partnerships?

- Require a discussion of partnerships in narrative.
- Agreement or MOU that lists who will be providing support to the watershed coordinator.
- Letters of Support that outlines what is being provided and the role that the supporting organization will play.
- Require mandatory letters of support.
- Documented proof that your organization coordinated with everyone within the watershed.

3. Eligibility

How should applicants verify nonprofit status?

- Use NTE codes to qualify nonprofits.
- Submit annual and strategic plans

- Provide mission statement and objectives of the organization to determine track record (past history and performance).
- 501 (c)(3) Section 170
- DOC should define local government with criteria for size.
- If awarded, DOC should provide payment for the preparation of the grant.
- Determination letter – proof of nonprofit.
- Impose an income ceiling, such as \$1,000,000
- CALFED goals should take precedent over the applicant's income or any other factor.
- Signed MOU is sufficient without having to apply to IRS for non-profit status.
- Candidates should have established audit requirement for a group that doesn't have nonprofit status or is a government agency.
- If a job is well done, it should not matter what type of organization it is.
- Local governments have a difficult time working outside their legal boundaries. A government representative replied that his agency works outside its boundaries as part of a regional agreement.
- Can a watershed coordinator work part time?
- The bottom line should be "Success". Will DOC require a spreadsheet that will measure success?
- DOC should look at prior grantees to determine if they have performed well. Any organization that has performed poorly should be ineligible or penalized.
- Someone else replied that DOC should look at all state grants to determine who is ineligible or penalized based on poor performance. Should not be limited to only DOC programs.

4. Costs

What costs should be allowed?

- Travel, meals, mileage, copies, and printing.
- Any presentation costs including graphic reproductions.
- Communication costs including website development and maintenance.
- Break down billable rates and define these in the application.
- Community education dealing with schools.
- Rent, cost of meeting rooms; not everyone is comfortable attending meetings that are being held in a government building.
- Overhead costs.
- Can CALFED set up a website that allows each watershed coordinator to post information. There is a precedent or model with the Weed Management Areas.

- To stretch dollars, there must be a line between watershed coordinator costs and project expenses. Meetings that deal with a project should not be paid from this grant but from the project's budget.
- Insurance. Someone else responded that any viable organization should already have insurance and that it should be a precondition to submitting a proposal.
- Other grants typically help pay for insurance.
- Someone replied that insurance is overhead and should be absorbed by the organization.
- Overhead should be a percentage of the grant to prevent an organization to have to provide every minute detail.
- Will there be a match requirement? Answer – No, but it will be a criteria and points awarded based on the amount of match provided.
- Will DOC withhold 10% of each invoice? Answer – DOC does not intend to at this point.
- An organization's council/board should be allowed as in-kind match.
- Although I like the idea of match, large well-funded organizations will have an advantage. Should balance this advantage against the partnership criteria.
- Will there be bias for cash match? Answer – We are still looking at this issue.
- Initial office set-up, computer, phone, etc.
- Projector.
- Someone asked what is the traditional amount that is paid for overhead. An audience member stated 5% - 15% is typically paid by a funding agency.

5. Sustainability

- Depends on the nature of the program and whether it grows and prospers.
- Criteria needs to be flexible.
- Give points but don't throw out any applications based on this criteria.
- Local government is already sustainable. DOC should recognize the difference between applicants.
- Don't really know sustainability up front.
- Not all groups have the same sustainability capacity.
- Points should be awarded based on entrepreneurship and creativity.
- Should be addressed in the narrative section.
- Points should be based on survivability over time.
- Consultants are not sustainable. Give extra points for organizations that do not use consultants. Response by audience member – My organization is not ready for employees because it is too expensive. We depend on consultants. Consultants allow organizations flexibility (i.e. workers comp).

- Points should be given to organizations that hire consultants that are local.

6. Other Comments

- Factors that should be used to evaluate a proposal include:
 - Organizations track record
 - Ability to leverage in-kind resources
 - Partnerships
 - Proven conservation programs
- Foster partnerships between various groups by using DOC to facilitate cooperation.
- What are the “demonstrated” benefits to the watershed according to CALFED. DOC should list them in the RFP. Answer: CALFED has listed the goals specifically on their website and it is comprehensive.
- Organizations should have diverse partners – public and private. Favor diverse partnerships over partnerships with just public agencies.
- Include requirements for performance measures.

1. USGS Watershed Boundaries

- Should be able to submit proposals based on current groups operating within the watershed. There should be no limitations.
- Some watersheds cover two counties.
- Consider anadromous versus non-anadromous watersheds.
- How does DOC plan to set up the program to accommodate political boundaries? Answer – Past grant programs relied on partnerships to address this issue.
- Hydrologic boundaries do not make sense. Watersheds are too big and become unmanageable. Hopefully, DOC will not redefine our existing watershed boundaries.
- Mokelumne and Cottonwood watersheds should be broken into smaller units.
- Shasta West includes five creeks.
- Sacramento Watershed is too big and should not include its tributaries.
- The USGS map worked well for the Upper Putah area.
- Divide watersheds according to stream order. For example, anything above 2.
- Some watersheds should be grouped together for biological reasons.
- CAL Water map is useless for the valley. Does not define watershed boundaries. Based on political factors.
- Watershed basins make sense as long as there are solid political agreements. DOC should recognize that both political and hydrological factors should be taken into account. We should develop a map of watersheds based on groups that currently operate in the area.
- Watershed groups have already set their boundaries on geopolitical boundaries in their area.
- Upper Cache Creek has two RCD's using one coordinator. This is working well. Using HUC codes worked well in this instance.
- HUC codes can work if an organization can apply for a partial HUC or more than one.
- Small rural groups are not as competitive as organizations working in urban environments because it is difficult to obtain resources, such as money.
- Watersheds should be addressed based on existing boundaries. Let groups define their own boundaries. DOC should accept all applications without limitations.
- Rural areas may have an advantage coordinating with their partners than would more urban areas.
- Some RCD's are based on political boundaries.
- Western Shasta RCD offered to draw a map of the area where existing groups are operating.
- Applicants should be allowed to submit proposals regardless of the map that is used. They must explain why they chose the boundaries. All watersheds are ultimately connected. Applicants must make their case.

- Concerned with the USGS map because many groups are working on different creeks within a watershed. Don't feel that the groups have the same issues.
- Watershed groups go to the problem. We work from the "land" up. Are people interested in the watershed? If yes, that is where we direct our emphasis.

2. Partnering and Coordination within watersheds

How can we ensure cooperation rather than competition?

- Award more points to an organization that has a coordinated approach. It is up to the applicant to make the point.
- Have as many cooperators as possible. There should be a prioritization mechanism to reward specific organizations that accomplish this goal.
- Competition makes organizations stronger.
- Mill Creek Conservancy – We don't have strong ties to RCDs and are concerned about this issue. Answer – DOC looks at all organizations alike and is concerned about an organization's ability to improve the watershed.
- Strong indication that there is evidence of continuity in partnership over time.
- Priority should be given to community-driven processes versus agency driven processes.
- Small rural watersheds will be at a disadvantage if DOC adopts a point system where groups are awarded points based on the number of partners that are identified in the proposal. Against this type of system.
- Areas that don't have watershed groups need to strategize on how to get a group.
- Partnerships/Cooperation between watersheds should be given points.
- Working within an urban watershed is complex and time consuming.
- There are many groups in Mendocino County. DOC should look at a group's community outreach capabilities and determine if they are meeting the community's needs or if the group interacts effectively with the community.
- What happens if more than 1 group submits a proposal from one watershed? There was no agreement on what to do from the audience.
- There should be a mandated communication mechanism for all the groups in the watershed to talk.
- Watershed coordinators on a countywide basis have too much work. Job is too big.
- Most grants have some form of accountability for the watershed coordinator. What will DOC do? Answer – we are going to require performance measures.
- Too big of an area will overwork the watershed coordinator. Not feasible.
- Evaluate the experience of the partners working together. For example, on education outreach or creek cleanup. What is their history together?
- Can we have a regional approval process?

How should applicants verify partnerships?

- Letters, MOU, sign-in sheets can be used to verify partnerships.
- References – DOC can call partners to verify their contributions. Maybe ask 4 or 5 pre-determined questions.
- Letter of Support using a standardized form from DOC.

3. Eligibility

How should organizations verify nonprofit status?

- Formation paperwork from the state or federal government.
- Employer eligibility number or federal tax number.
- By-laws or application to the state.
- Organization's mission statement, goals, objectives, list of board members, minutes, attendance rosters, etc.
- Someone cautioned about too much information.
- 501 (c) organizations must report to the state and are required to get a California Charitable number if they get donations.

4. Costs

What costs should be allowed?

- Allow overhead, auditing, utilities, telephone, mileage, travel, workshops, and training.
- Allow meeting costs, such as agendas, minutes, etc.
- Allow software, websites, and e-mail.
- Include salary and benefits.
- Allow furniture and computers.

5. Sustainability

- One work plan objective dedicated to getting funds.
- Sustainability of the program and not the person
- Rural communities have a difficult time finding resources
- Publication of manuals, documents, etc. that can be used for subsequent employees. Someone pointed out that these take time to develop and would limit the impact that a watershed coordinator would have on other tasks.
- Fund by who uses/enjoys the watershed.

6. Other Comments

- Allow advances.

1. USGS Watershed Boundaries

- None of the maps work in San Joaquin basin. They don't match hydrologic boundaries. Could use the basin maps as identified by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- Whatever watershed map is used should be easy to find. Preferably, listed in several locations.
- Could use a combination map – DWR and RWQCB.
- Would DOC like to see proposals that address the entire watershed or portions thereof? Answer – CALFED would like to see an entire watershed addressed to ensure a comprehensive, collaborative approach.
- Does the entire watershed have to be within the CALFED solution to be considered for funding? Answer – No decision has been made yet.
- Our group works on both the Chowchilla and Fresno rivers. Can we submit a proposal that addresses both rivers? Answer – Yes, as long as you meet CALFED's goals and address the issues within the watershed.
- DOC should be flexible in addressing watershed boundaries. Groups often work within political boundaries and need flexibility.
- The issue about watershed boundaries appears fuzzy. Are there any agreed upon boundaries statewide? What does CALFED and DOC use? Answer – There are no boundaries statewide. CALFED does not have any specific boundaries identified and DOC has used the USGS map in the past.
- RWQCB has a management initiative program that identifies specific problems within a watershed. Maybe DOC could integrate that into their system.

2. Partnering and Coordination within watersheds

How can we ensure cooperation rather than competition?

- If you only fund one watershed coordinator per watershed, it may force organizations to work together.
- What if the watershed is extremely large? Answer – In the past watershed coordinators focused on portions of a watershed.
- DOC should have a mechanism to notify everyone that someone else in the watershed is planning on submitting a proposal.
- Can we have a watershed coordinator in the upper and lower reaches of a watershed? There are differences in each part that make it difficult for one coordinator to address.
- The costs are higher if a watershed coordinator must cover a large watershed. That person must travel greater distances and incur additional costs for meals, mileage, and hotels.
- A larger watershed has problems in generating desire within the local community. The further the distance and the more political boundaries that must be crossed the harder it is to energize the local residents.

Fresno
Workshop Comments

27 August 2003

- Will requiring established partnerships prevent recently organized groups from qualifying?

What should be required to document partnerships?

- MOUs, attendance lists, letters of support could be used to document local partnerships.
- Letters of support are good but you want to also gauge the level of participation.
- Description of what each partner's contribution will be and what they plan to do.
- Documented activities on an organization's website or in their newsletter.
- Meeting minutes, agenda

How can we ensure a wide distribution of grants?

- Must show coordination with CALFED
- Applicants should coordinate with San Joaquin River Management Program (SJRMP), which would ensure regional cooperation. Someone else responded that the SJRMP suggestion would add another layer of bureaucracy that might add too much time to the process and slow things down too much.
- Will there be an emphasis on local partnerships or agency partnerships? Answer – CALFED would like to see a local emphasis.
- Geography is a clear way to ensure that DOC gets a wide geographical dispersion throughout the state. (north vs. south issue)
- One watershed coordinator per watershed.
- Place a cap on the amount of salary that will be reimbursed.
- Fund a certain number of grants for each regional area.
- Provide funding to those watersheds that have not received funding in the past.
- Base funding on social economic conditions. Provide funding to those areas that are at an economic disadvantage.
- Provide an allowance to those proposals that have a greater merit to the watershed.
- Provide a certain percentage of funding for each CALFED region or for each of the conditions that DOC has identified.
- There is an inherent problem in trying to determine how to allocate grants without knowing the distribution of applications.
- Use a formula such as dollars per mile or acreage.
- Can an ineligible organization be a partner? Can universities be partners? Answer – Yes, universities may partner, but cannot apply directly unless they have nonprofit status.

3. Eligibility

How should organizations verify nonprofit status?

- 501 (c) 3 letter
- A requirement for an organization to have been in existence for a certain length of time.
- Require nonprofits submit some type of resource plan.
- It is important to ensure that applicants demonstrate a benefit to the CALFED solution area.
- Applicants should have some form of audit process to ensure accountability for the funding.
- Require record of past performance

4. Costs

What costs should be allowed?

- Office space, clerical support, meeting space and food.
- Advertising
- Educational outreach activities
- Minor publishing costs, such as brochures, agendas, etc.
- Range of authorized hourly wages according to region. Maybe based on prior funding levels in previous grants.

5. Sustainability

- Not appropriate to use this category as a selection criterion.
- Any position funded by grants will not be a perpetual position.

6. Other Comments

- Is there any flexibility with the time period of the grant? Can the period be extended?
Answer – Don't know yet since it is Proposition 50 money.
- Who will be deciding on the grantees? We are concerned that the southern portion of the state will not be well represented on the selection committee.
- Will the current reporting requirements be reviewed to determine if they can be streamlined? Answer – We will look at it.
- Will there be an upper limit on the grant awards?
- Will funding be on a reimbursable basis?
- Will existing coordinators have an advantage in the new round of funding? Answer – No, all proposals will be judged based on the same criteria.

**Fresno
Workshop Comments**

27 August 2003

7. Comments received after workshop

- From review of your information there is concern given the large extents of the “watersheds” and our suggestion would be to allow a watershed to be identified as a smaller aerial designation allowing for more specific information to be developed and conveyed to local entities and the public.

1. USGS Watershed Boundaries

- Contra Costa County is bisected by five HUCs. These HUCs are being remapped via the updated Cal Water map. How should the county indicate which HUC to use?
- Is CALFED emphatic about one coordinator per watershed? Or are multiple watersheds under one coordinator acceptable?
- What is a watershed coordinator?
- Has there been a redefinition of watersheds?
- It is possible to redefine the HUC watersheds into smaller sub-watersheds.
- Watershed boundaries should be self-defined and self-selected by applicants.
- What are the issues with the HUC watersheds?
- Applicants should be able to select their own watershed boundary and be required to provide support to explain their boundary their proposal.
- Metropolitan areas have too many interest groups to coordinate in one watershed. It will be very difficult to gain cooperation of all these diverse groups to submit just one application per watershed. "Not impossible, but can be like moving a supertanker."
- Unincorporated areas should not be overlooked in this grant process.
- How can the money be split between multiple partners when it is only funding a coordinator?
- Whatever map is used won't matter unless arbitrary rules such as one coordinator per watershed is required. Whatever map is decided on should be used on a descriptive basis only.
- Will grants be for a set amount so that an area has to split the grant award among several coordinators? (Block grant concept?)
- What parameters would show a "direct benefit" to the watershed?
- Geographic boundaries should remain flexible and should be left to the applicant to determine.
- The Bay area has 12 to 15 coordinators already. Fixed boundaries would lead to overlapping watersheds. DOC shouldn't rely on just one criterion to determine boundaries.
- It would be a lost opportunity to have only one person per watershed because each watershed/community group has different areas of expertise. DOC should allow some sharing of the funding.
- Based on discussions, it sounds like applicants need more lead time to partner and prepare their proposal than the schedule announced by DOC staff.
- Are the coordinator positions required to be full-time only, or can applicants use time-share or part-time positions also.
- An example of multiple watersheds under one coordinator is Friends of Five Creeks.

- One watershed coordinator covers one section of a river. Another coordinator takes over from that person and provides coverage for the remaining area. This occurs because of differences in critical issues for each section of the river. It makes no sense for one coordinator to handle both areas since the differences are so pronounced.
- There is a threshold in densely populated areas where a coordinator cannot effectively coordinate with all interest groups within the watershed.
- DOC should encourage people to think strategically as they prepare their proposals since there is no way to please everyone. Be flexible.

2. Partnering and Coordination within watersheds

How can we ensure cooperation rather than competition?

- CALFED uses concept proposals to help applicants partner together. It's worked well in the past.
- Use selection criteria that give higher scores to applications that show partnering. Be willing to fund multiple positions part-time. Maybe a local government could act as lead and distribute funding to multiple coordinators.
- This topic seems to be a contradiction to compete on a watershed basis, but partner at the same time. This requires excellent people skills.
- We would get a lot of good out of giving some seed money to small groups. DOC maintaining a database to assist applicants with partnering is a good idea.
- DOC should consider combining the concept proposal idea with the partner database.
- DOC should adopt the requirement for applicants to submit an "intent to submit proposal" notice to avoid the issue of last minute partnering with latecomers.
- DOC should require applicants discuss their skills of facilitation/consensus building in proposal.
- Will nonprofits be equally considered against RCDs and local government? Answer – Yes.
- Trying to pull multiple groups under one coordinator position will be incredibly difficult. DOC will lose the benefit of one group who is good at consensus building while another is good at watershed restoration. DOC should support multiple positions.
- Will one eligibility criterion be preferred over the other two?
- DOC should consider using a geographic area instead of HUC areas, which are too large.
- Will DOC set standards for work plans?
- Is an application with multiple funding sources more competitive than one with just state money?

How can DOC ensure wide distribution of grant funds?

- Use geographic distribution.
- Allow more part-time positions spread out over state

- Workplans could dedicate work in one area the first year, another area the year after, etc.
- Will grant only fund coordinators who work with watershed councils?
- Will quarterly reports be posted on the web?

How can DOC verify partnering in proposals?

- Use history of past performance.
- Contact partners and require MOUs.
- History of past performance doesn't account for new partnerships that could prove very beneficial.
- Document existing stewardship groups.
- Identify whom you've worked with in the past.
- Local government and RCDs have resolutions that may show partnering history.
- Only require "proof" after the grant is awarded due to short preparation time for proposal.
- Good old letter of support should show cooperation and support.
- In addition to "benefit to watershed", include criteria of benefit from/through partnerships.
- Require applicants to identify who they will hire or ensure that people skills are included as job description.
- Don't put too much weight on letters of support. They aren't always reliable.
- On-the-ground performance measures are not realistic for this type of grant.
- Performance measures should not be based on implementation.
- Coordination, facilitation, and partnerships are completely different skill sets than are needed for on-the-ground success.
- Selection criteria should not weight direct benefits over long-term goals of community areas and partnering.
- "On the ground" performance measures will be difficult to measure and prove.
- Are there some groups that shouldn't be partnered with?
- DOC should be explicit in the RFP about whether we're favoring or expecting a collaborative partnership building process (i.e. CRMP).

3. Eligibility

How should organizations verify nonprofit status?

- Use 501(c)(3) letter of determination.
- Ask CALFED about nonprofits.

4. Costs

What costs should be allowed?

- Allow postage, meeting costs, computers, and mileage.
- Include facilitator salary for community meetings.
- Allow costs for software licensing.
- Allow office costs and standard business expenses.
- ESRI has a grant program for nonprofits to assist with purchase of the software.
- 15% administrative costs seem generous for a state program.
- Allow training costs and costs to attend conferences.
- Require applicants pay two-thirds of capital equipment costs.
- Allow hospitality (food).
- Hold workshops/training for coordinators.
- Put a cap on funding per grant (say \$80 K/year).
- Require competitive salaries.
- Allow meeting stipends for volunteers.
- Allow reference materials.
- Consider annual workplan for flexibility.
- Allow laboratory costs (water samples).
- Allow web site hosting.
- Allow flexibility in changing costs between budget categories (say up to 20%).
- Allow cost for flyers/pamphlets/newsletters.

5. Sustainability

- Napa RCD has been successful in obtaining funding for different projects, but no watershed coordination.
- Use coordinator as lobby position to generate additional funding (grassroots effort).
- No safety net in place, but may be good to wean people off this funding. They'll have to get back in line.
- Provide training to coordinators on how to conduct community fund raising to sustain position.
- It takes about five years for a group to determine if they can sustain their program. Include a fund raising component in RFP.
- It is unrealistic to ask people after just three years to sustain a program, but ask what they've done to seek other funding.

Oakland
Workshop Comments

3 September 2003

- Concept is not to sustain the person in the coordinator position, but the duties/activities of the position. Program could be considered successful if another entity took on all or a portion of the coordinator's duties.
- Include a section in the RFP where applicants discuss how they plan to sustain themselves.
- Conduct a meeting at end of program to discuss what worked and what didn't.
- DOC should slowly wean coordinators off rather than just cutting them off suddenly.
- A criterion should be how applicant plans to sustain position (include a performance measure in work plan).

6. Other Comments

- Consider economic justice/outreach to 3rd world peoples.
- Use an applicant's economic diversity as a screening criterion.
- Is DOC looking strictly for coordinator positions or can the positions branch out to assist in other areas?
- The selection committee should have at least one NGO representative participating.
- Set up advising group to identify needs of coordinators.
- Give access to coordinators to Dunn and Bradstreet for fund raising purpose.

1. USGS Watershed Boundaries

- Watershed boundaries should be as small and discreet as possible.
- DOC should allow sub-watersheds.
- Recognize that small watersheds have their own discreet geographic area.
- Subwatersheds in urban areas are being highly impacted. Proposals in these watersheds should have a population weighted criteria. Suggest using the 2000 census to help determine creeks impacted by high populations.
- DOC should fund watersheds that are listed as a priority on the SWRCB 303(d) list.
- Each RWQCB has digital watershed boundary maps.
- Suggest DOC have more coordination and discussion with DWR regarding watershed issues to help prioritize watersheds.
- Use GIS data to manage coordination between sub-basins.
- California State University, San Bernardino is doing some GIS work in the Santa Ana watershed and its sub-basins. A hydrological data model being worked on by ESRI might be helpful.
- AB 2117 came out with population numbers in the watershed basins but population densities should not be used as a criterion.
- Can there be multiple coordinators in the larger watersheds?
- It would be more cost effective to have coordinators for those watersheds with basin plans in place.
- CARCD is opposed to just one coordinator per watershed. This would give a greater advantage to larger groups. CARCD suggests that DOC require pre-proposals.
- Counties have an advantage over special districts and nonprofits due to their large paid staffs.
- DOC should establish criteria to measure how well proposal meets objectives of work plan and CALFED goals rather than boundaries.
- Obtain stormshed map and compare to HUCs. Counties and large cities might have them. Stormshed maps are based on traditional hydrologic boundaries. Stormsheds would take into account urban changes.
- Make the watershed boundaries the same as RCD boundaries.
- The SWRCB has already delineated boundaries. Use the boundaries they have created instead of recreating boundaries.
- Delineation of boundaries is good, but should not be left to the applicant. A higher authority such as the regional board should delineate the watershed boundaries.
- Discussing watershed boundaries is getting off track. DOC should consider watersheds as a whole and apply CALFED's goal to reduce pumping from the Bay Delta to ship to Orange County against all the proposals.
- If DOC uses large boundaries, it should allow flexibility in the proposals.

- One coordinator per watershed is too inflexible.
- A more important criterion is the history of coordination for an area.
- I am concerned that we are discussing new watershed boundaries just for this grant. In San Diego, we would like to see one or two positions to coordinate since our watersheds are set and have a number of groups already active in them.
- Use one overall watershed coordinator to bring together sub-watersheds. Highly urban streams may need more coordinators.
- I'd like to see watershed boundaries based on a consideration for urban streams, not political boundaries.

2. Partnering and Coordination within watersheds

How to insure cooperation rather than competition

- Having pre-proposals would be helpful. Take advantage of the EPA "surf your watershed" website for database.
- Some of the HUC watersheds are extremely large. For example, it may not be realistic to coordinate on a large watershed like Santa Monica Bay.
- Concerned about late-comers (Delta Keepers) that may not partner. Consider a two page pre-proposal.
- Have applicants include proof of their partnerships and the history of the partnerships.
- Require applicants to submit letters of support to show partnering in order to distinguish from those that don't partner.
- Consider an "intent to apply" that is even just one page.
- Evaluate preproposals using CALFED parameters. Some groups can't spend the time to prepare a 20-page proposal if it will not rank high to begin with. Pre-proposals would help weed out those who have no chance of being funded.
- Give organizations the incentive to coordinate and reward them.
- Publish sign-in sheet so people in room can start working together.
- Apply mechanism to help coordinate proposals from the same watershed rather than just throw them out. Give proposals from the same watershed another chance to coordinate and submit one proposal.
- Pre-proposal concept would allow people to coordinate with new groups that are not well known yet. New groups in new areas should be considered.
- Apply some mechanisms to help new groups.

How to insure a wide distribution of funds

- Distribute funding by biodiversity lines or SWRCB lines. Limit cities to 5% of the funding.

**Riverside
Workshop Comments**

5 September 2003

- Southern California appears to be cut out of funding due to the requirement to benefit the Bay-Delta. The criteria for people in Southern California are much more stringent.
- CALFED is interested in who is using the Bay-Delta water. Reduction in use is a priority.
- Under Eligibility Criteria 2 (the requirement that applicants benefit the Bay-Delta and support the CALFED Water Use Efficiency Program) what can be considered besides water conservation?
 - Answer (from an attendee) The LA area has received funding from CALFED for a water conservation project. Ground water protection is also important. It's important to use a watershed management approach.
- Use Water Board boundaries or limit 2 coordinators per large watersheds.
- Don't use Water Board boundaries!
- NRCS generally uses an allocation formula (regionally) in awarding its grants (EQIP).
- Use eligibility criteria with a percentage emphasis, say 50% for criteria #1, 25% for criteria #2, and 25% for criteria #3.
- How much are we looking for existing groups versus new groups just starting. RFP could include a list of groups/projects already active to help new groups.
- Chances of competing in Santa Monica are slim to none. We'd like to see at least 20% – 30% of money being spent in criteria # 2 areas. For example, prop. 13 funding allocates 60% to Southern California.
- Concerned that criteria #2 area must make water conservation the centerpiece of the work plan.
- Can funding be split among multiple agencies to fund part-time coordinators, which is submitted under one proposal. For example, in the San Diego area there are already several watershed coordinators. Where is the incentive to add a new watershed coordinator? Wouldn't it be better if the existing watershed coordinators could share the funding? Answer– not ruled out, but such a proposal would be less competitive.
- Distribute money by solution area map.

How should applicants prove partnerships

- The application should include a narrative of history of the collaboration between partners.
- Proof will vary based on groups so there may not be one specific type of proof.
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and signed watershed plans.
- Would showing a match from elsewhere be proof of partnering?
- Rural watershed may not be able to obtain letters of support. Perhaps letters of support should require specific information or be from stakeholders within the watershed.
- "Territory Jumping" by watershed groups requires qualitative observation.

- Check with local government or leaders to verify partnerships are occurring or partnering groups actually exist.
- Partnerships should not be limited to financial match.

3. Eligibility

- CARCD would like DOC to consider conservation districts recode in watershed management. An applicant's track record has to be considered. Require annual audits and 5-year plans. Large cities and municipalities should be excluded or limited to small part of funded proposals. Require established partnerships, proven conservation programs and open meetings. Leveraging funds and the ability to provide the watershed coordinator with technical assistance should be required.
- Funding should be limited to entities that doing watershed planning within 303(d) listed watersheds.

Proof of Nonprofit status

- For non-profits use federal ID #.
- Use latest annual report.
- Use annual audits.
- Use annual tax returns. It is easy to incorporate tax returns and it will show that the nonprofit has a track record.
- Don't allow non-profits that are in financial trouble.

4. Costs

- What is acceptable range for salary?
- Will we allow advances?
- Is there a limit on the grant amount?
- Allow refreshments for stakeholders.
- Allow website set up costs.

5. Sustainability

- Should not make this a determining criterion. Applicants can't make it part of a grant plan because the money is drying up. Tell grantees up front that only for 3 years.
- Give an extra couple of points to those proposals that address the issue.
- Will coordinators be allowed to include fund raising in the work plan.
- Non-profits are always fundraising so it is not an issue for them.
- I think including a sustainability aspect is a great thing to include. It will encourage people to think long term.

6. Other Comments

- What type of performance measure does DOC expect to see?
- Will DOC tie performance measures to water conservation?
- How will DOC ensure that reviewers will be familiar with Southern California issues?
- Outreach and education are critical in watersheds and should be allowed in work plans.
- You should not hold workshops in Southern California on Friday afternoons.